



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

IN HIRZEL'S most interesting and instructive book, *Der Eid, Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte* (Leipzig, S. Hirzel), the section 'der Eid als Fluch', in which he explains the formula, 'So help me God', brings up a bit of actuality, which gives striking confirmation to the author's remarks on the steady decline of the binding power of the oath. True, witnesses still 'kiss the book' but the time-honored formula, 'So help me God' has just disappeared from the Maryland courts. In fact, nothing would be easier than to write a commentary on antique life in terms of to-day. Demosthenes against Kallikles (LV), an old and especial favorite of mine, was illustrated a few years ago by a lawsuit concerning a drain at Roland Park, a suburb of Baltimore; and the Pseudo-Demosthenean speech, *πρὸς Ζηνόθεμιν* (XXXII)—a bottomry case—is made more vivid by the following clipping from a Baltimore newspaper of March 26, 1899: 'Greek sailing vessels visited this port many years ago, but merchants had little confidence in them, as they were apt to change their names while on the voyage, put into a port, sell the cargo and nothing more could ever be heard of them'. This is an instance of the continuity of history that would have delighted the heart of Mr. Freeman, who, by the way, was not a close student of the Attic orators (A. J. P. XII 521). These are the coincidences that commend the study of antiquity to the young and I have often asked myself why no enterprising scholar has been found to prepare a Greek Reader on the basis of the private orations of the Attic canon. The Greek would be beyond cavil and the contents would not be without human interest. To be sure, much has been done for the Attic Orators since I wrote, now some thirty years ago, a short series of sketches entitled 'On the Steps of the Bema' in which I insisted on the importance of this range of reading. About the same time, PERROT was doing similar work in the 'Revue des Deux Mondes', as I found out afterwards, and needless to say, doing it much better; and the purely philological literature that has gathered about the Attic Orators in the last score of years is immense. A portly Italian book on Isaïos, CACCIALANZA, *Le Orazioni di Iseo* (Torino, 1901), is still awaiting review, to say nothing of monographs and dissertations, but the desiderated Reader has not made its appearance yet. Meanwhile we can all study WILAMOWITZ'S *Lesebuch*, which bids defiance to the restrictions of Atticism, and has for its ensign the head of Alexander the Great. To review the book would be to review one's own philological life and to confess one's own philological shortcomings, so that it is not surprising that the work has been more

than once taken up in hope and laid down in despair. It is impossible for a man of my generation to consider it seriously as a schoolbook, and if I were to characterize it, I should echo the words of Pomtow, who in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* (9. Mai 1903), calls it, 'das schönste und lehrreichste Geschenk—für die Philologen'. Nothing more stimulating, nothing more illuminating, nothing that serves better to remind old scholars as well as young of the gaps in their knowledge of antiquity, the imperfection of their acquaintance with the real significance of it for itself and for our own times. For this particular office the *Lesebuch* will be found as useful as Ovid's *Ibis* is, according to Niebuhr (A. J. P. III 87), for those who fancy that they know Greek mythology.

By the way, a reviewer of my 'Problems in Greek Syntax' has lately taken me to task for quoting BLASS against the *Lesebuch* in the matter of the tenses in later Greek (A. J. P. XXIII 241). 'Der von Gildersleeve behauptete Widerspruch zwischen Blass und Wilamowitz', says PH. WEBER in the *Neue Philologische Rundschau* 5. Sept. 1903, '<ist> bei näherem Zusehen völlig unbegründet. Blass hat in der zitierten Stelle, wo er sagt, die Unterscheidung zwischen dauernder und vollendeter Aktion geschehe im N. T. mit derselben Genauigkeit wie im klassischen Griechisch, nur das Imperfekt und den Indikativ Aorist im Auge, während es bei Wilamowitz heisst 'Der Unterschied zwischen den Imperativen des Praesens und des Aorists wird in den vulgären Rede vernachlässigt'. I am not afraid of 'das nähere Zusehen'. In the passage referred to, BLASS, G. N. T. G. § 57 (E. T.), says: 'The distinction between continuous and completed action is most sharply marked in the case of the imperfect and aorist indicative and moreover, this distinction is observed with the same accuracy in N. T. as in classical Greek'. By saying 'is most sharply marked in the case of the imperfect and aorist indicative', he does not exclude the distinction in the other moods, and in § 58 after saying that 'between the moods of the present and aorist there exists essentially the same relation as that which exists between the imperfect and aorist', he goes on to discuss at length the distinction between present and aorist imperative in the N. T., so that the conflict between the two authorities abides, as I stated it. The failure to feel the difference between the tenses of the moods may be the fault of the student and not the fault of the language, and I have said that 'learners must be made to distinguish with equal sharpness between the present and the aorist infinitive' (A. J. P. III 165). And yet I felt constrained to add, 'but after all, the indicative gives the main lines and the other moods only the shading'. There are very nice questions along this line of study and the imperatives of the

N. T. demand a special treatment. The preference for the aorist in certain spheres of Hellenistic Greek is marked, as I pointed out many years ago, *Just. Mart. Apol. I 16, 6* (1877), cited in *A. J. P. XXIII 241*. In classical times the present imperative is slightly ahead, if we may judge by the orators (cf. *C. W. E. Miller, A. J. P. XIII 425*). The aorist differentiates. In later times there seems to be a preference for the aorist. If so, the present would differentiate. Interesting is the *Schol. AB on Ξ 5* <πίνε> ἀντὶ τοῦ πίνει ὡς τὸ διεφαίνετο χάρος πιπτόντων ἀντὶ τοῦ πεσόντων.

Much syntactical work goes to waste in out of the way places, in 'programmes' and 'Beilagen' and it is a pity that there is no clearing house, no 'Jahresbericht' to gather up the results, or, if there be no results, to affix the *mortiferum* Θ. In his *Beobachtungen über den Gebrauch des Artikels bei Personennamen*, a Nürnberg Beilage of 1899, which fell into my hands the other day, the author takes no notice of any of his predecessors. One of these predecessors, KARL SCHMIDT, as the attentive readers of the *Journal* know, declined to take up the articular proper name in Xenophon on account of the uncertainty of the text (*A. J. P. XI 483*). Cf. Joost's Xenophon (S. 63). But ZUCKER has no difficulty on that score and attacks the problem, as it presents itself in the *Anabasis*, with great vigor and lavish expenditure of words. The upshot of his investigations will not be novel to those who have looked into the subject at all. 'The true domain of the article with proper names is the narrative and not the speech'. 'In artistic narrative', he believes,—he need not have been so modest,—'especially in the purposely naive style, the element of poetic ἐνάργεια plays a far other rôle than in the speech, the mainspring of which is logical proof'. Now all that this 'poetische Anschaulichkeit', which I have just translated 'poetic ἐνάργεια' amounts to is conveyed by the term 'familiar language', the language of verbal gesture (cf. *A. J. P. XXIII 9, 123*). To dispose of the 'anaphora' formula as Professor ZUCKER has done is an easy matter (*A. J. P. XI 483*) but the average student will not be much helped by the word 'reaction', which really means nothing more than 'contrast', another old formula which certain scholars have worked pretty hard. See Herbst *A. J. P. II 541* and cf. *Monro, H. G. § 259*. When 'reaction' fails, Professor ZUCKER,—and it must fail him when several articular proper nouns follow in succession,—then he has to fall back on such vaguenesses as 'special' or 'natural interest.' Like so many other grammatical observations, these categories may serve to help the appreciation, but apply the test of reproduction and what then? Take a translation of Xenophon's *Anabasis* and put the article before the proper names in accordance with ZUCKER's canons and watch the result. In fine, the article with the proper noun is a superfluity.

It is what I have just called it, a verbal gesture. The reaction is a responsive nudge of the elbow, the special interest is an aggressive thrust of the forefinger between the ribs. We read in Joost (p. 63) that in the *Anabasis* there are 390 proper names of persons with, and 900 without the article. Gemoll tells us that Xenophon says *Kῦρος* 196 times, *ὁ Kῦρος* 28 times. Schmidt (A. J. P. XI 483) shows how little the article is used in the orators. The figures tell the whole story better than Professor ZUCKER's sixty odd pages have done.

Nothing in Lucian's *Vera Historia* ever tickled me more than the passage in which Homer is made to say that he composed all his spurious verses himself, and some of the Homeric verses that have fallen under the ban of the critic are especial favorites of mine, such as *χείλεα μὲν τ' ἐδίηνε, ὑπερφῶν δ' οὐκ ἐδίηεν*, perhaps because this particular line is an epitome of the behaviour of that stepdame, Fortune, towards most of us. But even if the experience goes no farther than the lips, it is worth something, and if I had not served for a few weeks in a cavalry regiment, I should not have warmed to W. HELBIG'S *Ἰννεῖς Ἀθηναῖοι* recently published in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. The article is profusely illustrated and the subject is thus brought within the reach of a wider public. Portentously alive are the figures of horses and men, and one is tempted to read again Cherbuliez's *Cheval de Phidias* and Morgan's edition of Xenophon on Horsemanship and to ride the ghost of a favorite mare bareback in spirit.

To all who value the high example of mature work, the rare example of work that from the beginning has shown no sign of weakness, no loss of power, the new edition of VAHLEN'S *Ennius* (Teubner)—the old edition goes back to 1854—will be doubly welcome both for its own sake and for the final disposition of the rumor so long current in philological circles that the master had resolved to leave the great work of his life as a legacy and not to await the reception of it as a gift. That there was some danger of this appears from the words that introduce the *Addenda et Corrigenda*: 'Propero ad finem, ut hic liber, cui non dicam quot annos vitae tribuerim—tandem in lucem publicam prodeat'. But that danger is past. There will be loud acclaim, there will be no lack of criticism. *λίθον ἔψεις, ἔλεγεν*. But these things are for the many. To very few will the book bring with it, as it does to me, a vision of the past, a renewal of youth, for very few are left of those who filled Ritschl's lecture room in 1852, very few that can remember the senior of the Philological Seminary as he sat on the front bench alone, already separated from the rest of us by gifts and attainments that roused no feeling but admiration.

I have at my elbow the Ennius of 1854 and a bound volume of the dissertations of the day which contains Vahlen's *Quaestiones Ennianae Criticae* (1852). I remember as if it were yesterday the 'promotion' of Josephus Lawicki whose dissertation was entitled, *De Fraude Pauli Merulae* and among the 'adversaries' was Ioannes Vahlen, Phil. Dr. renuntiandus. The Vahlen of to-day passes Lawicki by in silence and simply agrees with the Dutch scholar who upholds 'de geloofwaar digheid van Paullus Merula.' No wonder then that I cut the leaves of the new Ennius eagerly, foretaste the pages that tell of the life of Ennius among men and the after-life of Ennius in the long lapses of Roman Literature and pause to read and reread the story of the prize essay, the generous competition, the memorable award. 'Erit fortasse' says VAHLEN, 'qui haec quae singularem vim et virtutem Ritschelii luculenter expressam tenent non invitus legat;' and the image of the great teacher comes up before me in his prime as I have elsewhere tried to set it forth (A. J. P. V 339 foll.)

Why do I indulge in this personal reminiscence? It is not the sentimentality of a man who has nothing better to do than to brood over the past. Nay, one cannot emphasize too much the importance of the work that Ritschl did and caused to be done and the spirit that he infused into it. Well-rounded schemes for a regular Triennium Philologicum are very desirable and when one scans closely the courses once followed at the German universities, still followed at the German universities, everything seems to be at loose ends. There is no unity, no system in them. But so long as the teacher sets fire and the pupil takes fire, there is hope, and it is a hope that maketh not ashamed. We were all Plautus-mad and Ennius-mad in those days and I set myself, as a subject worthy of study, the points of contact between Plautus and Ennius. The two poets were contemporaries and there must be some trace of influence. I made little out of my quest, and in VAHLEN's judgment little has been made out of it by anybody (p. XXI), but though my studies have drifted far from Plautus and Ennius, and I have no right to a judgment on the final work of such a masterpiece as VAHLEN's *Ennius*, I know enough to appreciate in a measure the exquisite balance that is VAHLEN's own. Ritschl's pupil he is, but no true master is the lunar rainbow of another.

W. H. K.: In reading the excellent introduction to Dr. WILSON's *Juvenal*—a book which, long expected, fulfils expectation—I am reminded, at § 79, that, when discussing the *nec* of early Latin (in "Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve" pp.

32 ff.), I failed to remark on *necdum*. In fact, this compound seemed to display its character so plainly in the company it kept, that I felt no impulse to protest against any future association of it with the venerable Plautine *nec recte*. Virgil first has it—certainly once, twice if we trust the Palatine at Aen. IV 698. Now this passage has no demonstrable relation to Naevius or Ennius; and it is not in the ninth, or any other, Eclogue that we ought to search hopefully after archaisms. *Cuium pecus* proves as little as *olli*; it is one thing to please the ear with a rounder vowel or the avoidance of a repeated sibilant, and another to revive a form which is recommended by no euphonic superiority. And revival is always a conscious effort; whereas the influence of Greek, the language alike of his great models and his contemporary instructors, was for the Latin writer no less subtle than hard to resist. In turning the Terentian *ne nunc quidem* into *nec nunc*, Horace did not hark back to the Plautus at whom he sneered, but reproduced the familiar *μηδέ*; and though Theocritus could not use *οὐδέπω* there was nothing to prevent Virgil, whose Greek was a matter of speech as well as of reading, of prose as well as of poetry, from fitting the Latin equivalent into his verse. When we consider the opportunities of the two poets, we can only stand astonished at their purism.—Besides, to prove that this non-copulative *necdum* was a revival, we should have to discover it before Virgil; but it occurs only after him, in Livy, who was no purist, in Columella and Palladius, Tacitus and Pliny (Kuehner, II p. 619). *Où diable l'archaïsme va-t-il se nicher?* And yet the only Livian example at my command, XXI 18. 8, *necdum enim erant socii vestri*, shows a certain scrupulosity. The copulative force of *neque enim* resided originally in the first particle; when the second usurped it by virtue of its usurped causality, *neque* suffered a paralysis which, in the same connection, would easily affect *necdum*.—As to Juvenal, he certainly knew that his *nec ille* matched *οὐδ' ἐκεῖνος*, and could hardly have felt his *necdum* differently, if he used it in the sense of *nondum*. But why should we so interpret in I 6? The asyndeton here would be at least odd; the copula is quite natural, and has the same adversative value that Dr. WILSON, in § 74, notes for *et*. There is an instructive parallel in Tacitus, A. I 10, *concepto necdum edito partu*; the attempt to treat these participles as asyndetically coordinated and *nec* as *non* ends in a physiological *reductio ad absurdum*.

H. L. W.: The last quarter century has seen the publication of a large number of those interesting books known as *Festschriften*, which celebrate birthdays and anniversaries and do honor to the veterans of the academic world. This delightful custom by which students and friends give enduring expression to their admiration and love for a great master has found its way across the Atlantic

and several of the foremost American scholars also have thus been honored. The latest addition to literature of this class is the *Festschrift, zu Otto Hirschfelds sechzigstem Geburtstage* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1903, pp. 513, M. 20), to which sixty-three friends and pupils of the great epigraphist have contributed. The range of subjects represented in the volume is unusually wide, including Roman literature and various branches of Greek and Roman antiquities. The average value and importance, too, of the contributions, considered from a scientific point of view, are far greater than in many collections of a similar character. This is shown even by a glance at the table of contents, in which appear the names of C. Wessely, R. Schöne, F. Hiller von Gaertringen, U. Wilcken, S. de Ricci, B. Kübler, Th. Mommsen, A. von Premerstein, A. von Domaszewski, and others equally well known. Naturally a large number of the contributions belongs to the domain of Roman literature and epigraphy. Here are interesting and valuable articles by I. Vahlen, L. Gurlitt, H. Dessau, O. Seeck, C. Cichorius, L. Friedländer, J. Dürr, H. Dressel, E. Bormann, R. Cagnat, A. Schulten, E. Löwy, C. Huelsen, and others, a mere list of which would occupy too much space. On the whole, it is a remarkable collection, a worthy monument to one of the foremost scholars of our time, whose colleagues on this side of the Atlantic unite with his friends and pupils in wishing him yet many happy years of fruitful labor.

On the sixth of December, 1903, the present number of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY (No. 96) was nearly ready for issue, when the printing establishment of the Friedenwald Co. was wrecked by fire. In consequence of this disaster, it has not been found possible to resume publication until now and some time must elapse before the regular dates can be overtaken. During the long suspension of the printing, much copy has accumulated, many new books have been received, and the editor and the publishers invoke the indulgence of subscribers, contributors and correspondents.

B. L. G.